



# QUARTERLY ENERGY PROCUREMENT COMPLIANCE AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENT

San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
First Quarter of 2025 - Advice Letter 4651-E

Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division  
Utility Audits Branch  
September 19, 2025



## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Transmitted via e-mail

September 19, 2025

Adam Pierce  
Vice President – Energy Procurement and Rates  
San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
8330 Century Park Court, CP33B  
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Adam Pierce:

**Final Report Transmittal Letter – Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of San Diego Gas and Electric Company’s Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report for the period of January 1, 2025, through March 31, 2025**

The Utility Audits Branch (UAB) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has completed its agreed-upon procedures (AUP) engagement of San Diego Gas and Electric Company’s (SDG&E) Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report (QCR) filed for its First Quarter of 2025 in Advice Letter (AL) 4651-E. The final AUP report is enclosed.

SDG&E’s response to the AUP report’s findings are incorporated into this report. As required by Public Utilities Code Section 454.5(g), the confidential market sensitive information contained in the AUP report is redacted. We will post the final redacted audit report on our website at [Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Audit-Reports-by-Industry).

A corrective action plan addressing the findings is required. SDG&E has already provided the information regarding its corrective actions planned and those responses have been included in the report, no further actions are required.

We appreciate SDG&E’s assistance and cooperation during the engagement. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Tracy Fok, Program and Project Supervisor, at (415) 703-3122 [tracy.fok@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:tracy.fok@cpuc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Angie Williams*

Angie Williams, Director  
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division  
cc: See next page

Adam Pierce  
Vice President – Energy Procurement and Rates  
San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
September 19, 2025  
Page 2

cc: Brandon Henzie, Energy Risk Manager, Risk Management and Compliance, SDG&E  
Chris Summers, Director, Origination, Energy Supply and Dispatch, Energy Procurement and Rates, SDG&E  
Joe Pasquito, Market Analysis Manager, Origination and Portfolio Design, SDG&E  
Michelle Somerville, Regulatory Business Manager, California Regulatory Affairs, SDG&E  
Rachel Peterson, Executive Director, CPUC  
Kristin Stauffacher, Deputy Executive Director, Office of the Commission, CPUC  
Leuwam Tesfai, Deputy Executive Director for Energy and Climate Policy, ED, CPUC  
Merideth “Molly” Sterkel, Interim Director, ED, CPUC  
Jaime Rose Gannon, Program & Project Supervisor, ED, CPUC  
Eric Dupre, Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst, ED, CPUC  
Theresa Buckley, Assistant General Counsel, CPUC  
Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director, UAB, CPUC  
Tracy Fok, Program & Project Supervisor, UAB, CPUC  
Tim Baumgardner, Senior Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC  
Judith Mason, Financial Examiner IV, UAB, CPUC  
Keen Banh, Associate Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC  
Paulina Zepeda Gomez, Associate Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC  
Yaelan Wong, Staff Services Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC

## **MEMBERS OF THE TEAM**

**Angie Williams, Director**

**Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director**

**Tracy Fok aka Tracy Yeh, CPA, Supervisor**

**Tim Baumgardner, Lead**

**Judith Mason, Lead**

**Keen Banh, Staff**

**Paulina Zepeda Gomez, Staff**

**Yaelan Wong, Staff**

**A digital copy of this report can be found at:**

[Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/AuditReports)

**You can contact our office at:**

**California Public Utilities Commission  
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division  
400 R Street, Suite 221  
Sacramento, CA 95811**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| I. INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES..... | 1 |
| II. PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS.....   | 3 |
| A. TRANSACTION RECONCILIATION/ANALYSIS .....                               | 3 |
| B. QUARTERLY COMPLIANCE REPORT (QCR).....                                  | 4 |
| C. STRONG SHOWING JUSTIFICATION.....                                       | 5 |
| D. BILATERAL CONTRACTS.....  | 6 |
| E. REQUEST FOR OFFERS (RFO) CONTRACTS.....                                 | 7 |
| F. CONGESTION REVENUE RIGHTS (CRR) AND LONG TERM CRR (LTCRR).....          | 8 |
| G. PROCUREMENT REVIEW GROUP.....   | 9 |

## I. INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

---

The Utility Audits Branch (UAB) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) performed the agreed-upon procedures (AUP) enumerated in Procedures and Findings section of this report for San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E or the utility) energy procurement compliance reporting period of January 1, 2025, through March 31, 2025, (Q1 2025). These procedures were agreed to between CPUC's Energy Division (ED) and UAB solely to assist ED in determining whether the three large investor-owned electric utilities are in compliance with certain energy procurement-related state laws and CPUC energy procurement directives. SDG&E is one of these utilities<sup>1</sup> and is responsible for complying with the energy procurement requirements.

ED engaged UAB to perform this AUP engagement. UAB is required to be independent and to meet other ethical responsibilities in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to the AUP engagement. We conducted this engagement in accordance with attestation standards established by the generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). The sufficiency of the AUP procedures is solely the responsibility of ED. ED has agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate for the intended purpose of the AUP engagement. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described herein either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose. The results of the engagement are detailed in the Procedures and Findings section of this report.

We were not engaged to, and did not, perform an examination or review of the subject matter, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on SDG&E's compliance with the energy procurement-related state laws and the CPUC's energy procurement directives. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to ED.

The purpose of this report is to communicate to ED the utility's compliance and the results of the AUP performed. The report may not be suitable for any other purposes. The procedures performed may not address all the items of interest to users other than ED and may not meet the needs of all users of this report and, as such, users are responsible for determining whether the procedures performed are appropriate for their purposes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pacific Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company are the other two electric utilities subject to the agreed-upon procedures engagements.

In accordance with CPUC Decision (D.) 12-04-046, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 13, this report shall be made public. As required by Public Utilities (PU) Code Section 454.5(g), the confidential market sensitive information contained in the AUP report is redacted. The redacted report can be found on the CPUC public website through the following link: [Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](#).

*Angie Williams*

---

Angie Williams, Director  
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division (UARCD)



## II. PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

---

Below are the results of the AUP performed and associated findings. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of ED. Thus, UAB makes no representation regarding the sufficiency of the following procedures used for this engagement for the purposes for which this report has been requested.

### A. Transaction Reconciliation/Analysis

1. Inspected whether the utility's Q1 2025 electric physical (and transmission) transaction details in Attachment A<sup>2</sup> contained any electronic solicitation or other competitive solicitation transactions, requiring performance of the audit procedures indicated under Section E – Request for Offers Contracts.

Finding: We found no electronic/competitive solicitation transactions reported in Attachment A as a result of this procedure.

2. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q1 2025 electric physical transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment C. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q1 2025 electric financial transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment C. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q1 2025 gas physical transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment D. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q1 2025 gas financial transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment D. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

---

<sup>2</sup> All references to attachments in the list of Procedures and Findings are to the attachments filed with the utility's Quarterly Compliance Report subject to this engagement.



6. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q1 2025 transport, storage, park and lend transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment D.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

7. Compared the utility's spot market (i.e., Day-Ahead, Hour-Ahead, and Real-Time energy) electric physical purchases to its monthly retail energy needs, or energy physical purchase requirement, to determine whether the spot market purchases exceed five percent of the monthly retail energy needs, or energy physical purchase requirement.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

## B. Quarterly Compliance Report (QCR)

1. Inspected QCR advice letter filing, including the attachments of supporting documentation, to determine whether the filing was accurate and complete.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Identified any of the utility's authorized decision-makers that were not listed in QCR.

Finding: We did not find any of the utility's authorized decision-makers that were not listed in QCR.

3. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided its descriptions of and justifications for its procurement processes used to select the transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility explained or justified the timing of its transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility discussed the system load requirements/conditions underlying the need for the quarter's transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided a copy of any data of forecasts used by the utility to analyze transactions.

Finding: We found the utility provided a copy of forecast data used to analyze transactions.

7. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided a copy of each of the utility's procurement contracts reported in Attachment H – Contracts Executed/Contracts Amended.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

8. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided a reasonable number of analyses, as requested by CPUC or the Procurement Review Group (PRG) and provided the resulting outputs.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

9. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility's QCR included its briefing package provided to the ultimate decision maker.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

10. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided the break-even spot prices equivalent to the contracts.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

11. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided average price information for non-standard transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

12. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided California Independent System Operator (CAISO) electricity procurement information in the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

### C. Strong Showing Justification

1. Inspected Attachment A for any transactions subject to strong showing justification and inspected Attachment M – Transactions subject to Strong Showing, to determine whether the transactions were properly justified in Attachment M.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Compared the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products in Attachment A, which are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d), to the prices of relevant market supporting documentation to determine whether the bilateral contract prices are reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price in Attachment A to the market high and low prices to ensure a reasonable deal was completed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Inspected Attachment H for any transactions subject to strong showing justification and inspected Attachment M to determine whether the transactions were properly justified in Attachment M.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Compared the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products in Attachment H, which are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d), to the prices of relevant market supporting documentation to determine whether the bilateral contract prices are reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price in Attachment H to the market high and low prices to ensure a reasonable deal was completed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Inspected other bilateral transactions in QCR for any transactions subject to strong showing justification and inspected Attachment M to determine whether the transactions were properly justified in Attachment M.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Compared the prices of other bilateral contracts for non-standard products that are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d) to the prices of relevant market supporting documentation to determine whether the bilateral contract prices are reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price for other transactions to the market high and low prices to ensure a reasonable deal was completed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

#### D. Bilateral Contracts

1. Inspected PRG meeting materials to determine whether the utility consulted with its PRG for any contracts with terms over one calendar quarter before they were executed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Inspected counterparties' credit supporting documentation to validate that the contracts were executed bilaterally with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with credit protection such as surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, and net provision.

**Finding #1: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with Articles 1.6 (Interest Rate) and 6.2 (Timeliness of Payment) of the Confirmation Letter Master Edison Electric Institute (EEI) Service Agreement (MSA).** SDG&E did not enforce its MSA provisions regarding late payment penalties in a timely manner for a bilateral contract executed with [REDACTED]. SDG&E did not enforce the MSA late payment provisions until UAB requested supporting documentation demonstrating such enforcement.

#### **SDG&E's Response to Finding #1:**

On August 6, 2025, SDG&E stated:

SDG&E's current [REDACTED] process, [REDACTED] is entirely manual. Due to resource limitations, high-value or significantly late payments are prioritized before addressing small dollar interest amounts. To comply with various affiliate and confidentiality requirements, SDG&E's

energy procurement contract data is maintained [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] ...When applicable, interest is calculated in Excel, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] communicated to counterparties via email.

SDG&E's Energy Procurement team has been working with [REDACTED] to automate invoicing and implement reporting to flag late payments...SDG&E's Energy Procurement team has an active Request for Information (RFI) to explore vendors with the capability to automate the [REDACTED] payment tracking process.

3. Inquired with the utility as to whether the contracts had any impact on the overall Time to Expiration Value at Risk (TeVAR).

Finding: We found no contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

4. Identified any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) that was less than five years.

Finding: We did not identify any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or PPA that was less than five years.

5. Traced and agreed all bilateral contracts executed during the quarter to supporting documentation to ensure that they were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

#### E. Request for offers (RFO) Contracts

1. Inspected PRG meeting documentation to ascertain that the utility consulted with its PRG in a timely manner for contracts that exceeded one calendar quarter.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Inspected the utility's Independent Evaluator (IE) report to determine whether IE evaluated any contracts executed with affiliate(s) or any contracts with terms greater than two years.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Inspected counterparties' credit supporting documentation to validate that the contracts derived from the RFO selection process were executed with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with credit protection such as surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, and net provision.

**Finding #2: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with Articles 1.6 and 6.2 of the Confirmation Letter MSA.** SDG&E did not enforce its MSA provisions regarding late payment penalties in a timely manner for an RFO contract executed with [REDACTED]. SDG&E did not enforce the MSA late penalty provisions until UAB requested supporting documentation demonstrating such enforcement.

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #2:** See D.2

4. Inquired with the utility as to whether the contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

Finding: No contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

5. Identified any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or PPA with a term of less than five years.

Finding: We did not identify any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or PPA with a term of less than five years.

6. Traced and agreed all RFO contracts executed during the quarter to supporting documentation to ensure that they were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

#### F. Congestion Revenue Rights (CRR) and Long Term CRR (LTCRR)

1. Inquired with the utility and inspected evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG regarding its annual CRR nominations prior to submitting those nominations and participating in the CAISO's CRR nomination process.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Inquired with the utility and inspected evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG regarding any CRRs having a term greater than one calendar quarter prior to execution of such CRR.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Inquired with the utility and inspected evidence to determine whether the utility, prior to the PRG meeting, provided a list of proposed annual CRR and LTCRR nominations for allocation and auction, showing source (generation), sink (load), Megawatt (MW) quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), bid price, and a description the underlying arrangement that the CRR will hedge.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Inquired with the utility and inspected evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG to review its CRR position during the periodic position update discussions and provided the PRG with information regarding the CRR, including but not limited to source, sink, MW quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), price and a description of the underlying arrangement that the CRR will hedge (or in the case of a CRR sale, no longer hedge).

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Inquired with the utility whether it limits candidate CRRs to those CRRs with a source at which utility reasonably expects to procure power.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Inspected QCR to determine whether utility reports CRRs, which contain, at minimum, for each CRR, source, sink, MW quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), bid price (for CRR auctions or secondary market transactions), and a description of the underlying energy supply arrangement that the CRR will hedge.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

7. Inquired with the utility and inspected evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG regarding its LTCRR nominations prior to submitting those nominations and participating in the CAISO's LTCRR nomination process.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

8. Inquired with the utility and inspected evidence to determine whether it provided periodic updates at least quarterly to the PRG on how its previously obtained LTCRRs were performing. The PRG update should contain, at minimum, for each LTCRR, the term, source and sink, relation to grid use, expected value, and past performance.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

9. Inspected QCR to determine whether the utility reported LTCRRs, which contained, at minimum, for each LTCRR, the term, source and sink, relation to grid use, expected value, and past performance.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

## G. Procurement Review Group

1. Inspected the utility's PRG meeting calendar to ascertain that the utility held a regular PRG meeting at least once in Q1 2025.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Inspected the utility's PRG supporting documentation to validate that the utility implemented the requirements outlined in D.07-12-052, OP 7.

**Finding #3: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.07-12-052, OP 7.** SDG&E did not distribute all its PRG meeting agendas and materials to its members timely, 48 hours in advance for the January 17, 2025, and March 21, 2025, PRG meetings. SDG&E distributed the meeting agendas and materials on January 16, 2025, and March 20, 2025, respectively, rather than distributing them timely on or before January 15, 2025, and March 19, 2025, respectively. See the table below for details.

| PRG Meeting Dates | 48 Hours Notification Requirement | PRG Meeting Agenda Distribution Dates |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1/17/2025         | 1/15/2025                         | 1/16/2025                             |
| 3/21/2025         | 3/19/2025                         | 3/20/2025                             |

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #3:**

On July 30, 2025, SDG&E stated:

The delay in distribution was due to SDG&E finalizing key information and materials relevant to the PRG discussions. Our intent was to ensure that the most accurate and complete information was provided to PRG members. However, we recognize that this approach resulted in a failure to meet the 48-hour advance distribution requirement.

To prevent recurrence and ensure compliance with Commission requirements, SDG&E will distribute PRG meeting agendas and available materials at least 48 hours in advance of each meeting. If certain materials are not yet finalized, placeholders will be included with a note indicating that final versions will follow.

3. Inspected PRG meeting agendas to ascertain that the utility made a list of non-confidential discussion topics of the regular PRG meetings publicly available.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Inspected PRG meeting summary distribution information to validate that the utility's PRG meeting summaries were distributed (or made publicly available) on the earlier of a) 14 days after the PRG meeting, or b) 48 hours before the next regularly scheduled PRG meeting.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Inspected relevant supporting documentation to determine whether the utility's 95 percent TeVAR metric exceeded the established Customer Risk Tolerance (CRT). If yes, inspected PRG meeting material to determine whether the utility informed its PRG in a timely manner.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.